



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,622	04/14/2005	David S. Foell	1200210-2N US	8430
35227	7590	08/13/2008	EXAMINER	
POLYONE CORPORATION			SAFAVI, MICHAEL	
33587 WALKER ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AVON LAKE, OH 44012			3637	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/13/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Box 3-NOTE: Contd.** Proposed amendment to claims 1 and 4 would require further consideration beyond cursory review.

**Box 11: Contd.** As for the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, The instant disclosure does not set forth any correlation between what is shown in Fig. 4 and what is recited within the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the specification. The paragraph at lines 12 to 27 on page 14 of the specification merely sets forth a general description of Fig. 6 without setting forth any specific dimension or orientations. Fig. 6 does not present any specific graphic indicating any particular dimension or orientation of any of wall panel 22 and projections 28. Examiner disagrees that the language of claim 4 as presented within the response of April 06, 2007 is “supported, *in haec verbis*, by their Specification at Pages 5-6 and 14 and by their Fig. 6” or that “[t]he three sections of the application: Specification, Drawings, and Claims interlock to meet all requirements of § 112 and the regulations concerning the Drawings.” The specification does use words or phrases such as “projections extend parallel to each other” or “projections...extend toward each other” or “projections extend...parallel to the wall”. If “second projections” 28 of Fig. 6 extend toward each other so as to be perpendicular then “first projections” 28 do not extend parallel to one another and to the wall surface. Rather, “first projections” 28 extend collinear or coplanar to one another while extending parallel to the wall surface. Otherwise, “second projections” 28 would not be considered as extending “toward each other” and would be considered as extending parallel to each other. Meanwhile, as expressed above, Fig. 6 does not specifically define the

orientation of the projections 28 as by illustrating degree of angles. In other words, the specification sets forth multiple embodiments of forms, panels and connectors while expressing further possibilities of forms, panels and connectors. One of ordinary skill in the art would not ascertain that what is shown in Fig. 6 is the embodiment being defined within finally rejected claim 4.

As for the rejections involving the prior art, Applicant appears to be in disagreement with how the applied references are utilized against the respective claims. However, as set forth within the final Office action each of Johnson '262, Piccone '648, and Lanc '669 serve to read upon the language of claims 1, 4, 6, and 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Safavi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7046. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Michael Safavi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637

M. Safavi  
August 06, 2008